

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. [	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/721,535		11/25/2003	Lewis Schneller	SCL-100	5347	
46271	7590	11/01/2004		EXAMINER		
JEAN KYLE				CRANMER, LAURIE K		
P. O. BOX 2274 HAMILTON, MT 59840-4274		59840-4274		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE		
				3636		
				DATE MAIL ED. 11/01/200	DATE MAILED: 11/01/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	oplication No. Applicant(s)					
	Office Action Occasion	10/721,535	SCHNELLER ET	AL.				
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Laurie K. Cranmer	3636					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ddress \				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. o period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuting the period by the Office later than three months after the mailing period patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to bly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror te, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed  ys will be considered time in the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 A	August 2004.						
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)⊠ 6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) <u>9</u> is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on 16 August 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin Theorem 1.	: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).				
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document  2. Certified copies of the priority document  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document  application from the International Burea  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applica Onity documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No: /ed in this National	l Stage				
Attachmen	• •							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Ll Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D						
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 or No(s)/Mail Date			O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/721,535

Art Unit: 3636

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The Brief Description of the Drawings must be amended to include Fig. 6.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Middleton in view of Walters.

Middleton teaches a seat back for a chair comprising a support panel 20 to contact a seated person; a back panel 44; and a flap portion 28 extending from a top of the support panel and folding over the top and toward a back of the support panel, the flap portion *capable of* having indicia attached thereto, wherein the flap portion is not

secured to a back of the chair but stands away from the back of the chair (See Figs. 1 and 2) substantially as claimed except for the indicia attached to the flap portion.

The patent to Walters teaches a seat back for a chair including a flap 36 with indicia (a place card, col. 4, lines 35-37) attached thereto, wherein the flap has a transparent window 38 with a pocket for attaching an item thereto (a place card) to be old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Middleton device such that it had a window pocket for attachment of indicia as taught to be old by Waters thereby providing he obvious advantage of facilitating indicia display and attachment.

To attach the indicia by hook and loop fasteners or elasticized loop fasteners is considered to be an obvious mechanical expedient since Waters teaches temporary attachment means for the back flap to be "buttons 42, hook and loop fastener material" (e.g. Velcro, tm) and/or snaps 46" (col. 4, lines 50-51), by way of example. Clearly, one of ordinary skill in the art would choose an appropriate known mechanical fastener such as Velcro or elasticized loop fasteners.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is allowed.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/16/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the head rest flap of the seat cover of Middleton does not stand away from the back of the seat presenting the panel to those seated behind it. The Examiner disagrees. As seen in Figures 1 and 2, which show the cover positioned

Page 4

Art Unit: 3636

on a seat, flap 28 is clearly separated from the back of the seat on which it is covering. Middleton specifically recites that the flap 28 is placed over the back rest portion 16 of the seat as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 (Col. 2, lines 53-54), and that the cover is not secured to the seat 12 (col. 3, lines 35-36), which is clearly illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2.

The rejection is proper as stands.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie K. Cranmer whose telephone number is 703-308-2115. The examiner can normally be reached on T-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Cuomo can be reached on 703-308-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Laurie K. Cranmer Primary Examiner Art Unit 3636

LKC 10/28/04